

State of Alaska FY2003 Governor's Operating Budget

Department of Public Safety Performance Measures

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Governor's Key Department-wide Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 3 |
| Fish and Wildlife Protection Budget Request Unit..... | 6 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 6 |
| Fire Prevention Budget Request Unit..... | 8 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 8 |
| BRU/Component: Alaska State Trooper Detachments..... | 10 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 10 |
| BRU/Component: Alaska Police Standards Council..... | 13 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 13 |
| BRU/Component: Violent Crimes Compensation Board..... | 15 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 15 |
| BRU/Component: Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault..... | 16 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 16 |
| Statewide Support Budget Request Unit..... | 19 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 19 |
| BRU/Component: Laboratory Services..... | 22 |
| Key Performance Measures for FY2003..... | 22 |

Commissioner: Glenn G. Godfrey

Tel: (907) 465-4322 **Fax:** (907) 465-4362 **E-mail:** glenn_godfrey@dps.state.ak.us

Administrative Services Director: Kenneth E. Bischoff

Tel: (907) 465-4336 **Fax:** (907) 586-2762 **E-mail:** kenneth_bischoff@dps.state.ak.us

Governor's Key Department-wide Performance Measures for FY2003

Measure:

Hunter contacts made by the division.
Sec 117 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

First Quarter FY2002: 7,562 hunter contacts were made by FWP.

First Quarter FY2001: 7,880 hunter contacts were made by FWP. For the full Fiscal Year, 16,772 hunter contacts were made.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no comparative data from other jurisdictions.

Background and Strategies:

The Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection protects Alaska's wildlife resources by deterring violations or criminal activity through a combination of uniformed patrols, investigations and educational efforts. There are many difficulties associated with resource law enforcement and the Division routinely adjusts to address these challenges in the most productive manner.

Troopers devoted to wildlife law enforcement cannot provide the level of visibility in all fisheries and hunting areas to assure that resource users comply with Fish and Game regulations. Resource user contacts is one way to track basic deterrence which depends on a clear enforcement presence.

Carefully structured regional enforcement programs heighten presence by uniformed patrols in an area one season but target another area the next. Undercover operations might be selected as an enforcement strategy in one problem area, while education might be selected to focus on another area where particularly complex regulations have recently changed.

Measure:

The number of fire prevention educational contacts made by the division.
Sec 118 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Make 15,000 contacts for fire prevention education.

First Quarter FY2002: 21,337 contacts were made. 142% of goal achieved.

First Quarter FY2001: 5,418 contacts made.

Total FY2001 Results: There were 13,419 educational contacts. This was 89.46% of our goal.

Benchmark Comparisons:

Data from other states or departments are unavailable at this time.

Background and Strategies:

We have exceeded our goal, as we are able to field a full staff to conduct inspections and participate in a greater number of public forums to educate the public.

Measure:

Homicides and the percent solved per year.
Sec 119 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Our target is to solve 100% of homicide cases.

Within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:

CY2000 - 9 homicides; 100% solve rate

CY1999 - 25 homicides; 96% solve rate (or 24 cases)

The Division of Alaska State Troopers target for calendar year 2001 is to maintain the rate of homicides solved at 100%.

Benchmark Comparisons:

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of homicides and the percent solved per year. The national solve rate:

AST solve rate:

| | | |
|------|-----|------|
| 2000 | 63% | 100% |
| 1999 | 69% | 96% |

Background and Strategies:

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of homicides by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper homicide solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice.

Measure:

Rapes and the percent solved per year.
Sec 119 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Our target is to meet or exceed the national solve rate.

Within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:

CY2000 - 146 rapes occurred with a 53% solve rate (or 78 cases)

CY1999 - 156 rapes occurred with a 54% solve rate (or 85 cases)

Benchmark Comparisons:

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of rapes and the percent solved per year. The national solve rate:

AST solve rate:

| | | |
|------|-------|-----|
| 2000 | 46.9% | 53% |
| 1999 | 49% | 54% |

Background and Strategies:

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of rapes by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper rape solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice. **Rape** is defined as carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Attempts to commit rape by force or threat of force are also included.

Fish and Wildlife Protection Budget Request Unit

Contact: Col. Joel Hard, Director

Tel: (907) 269-5584 **Fax:** (907) 269-5616 **E-mail:** joel_hard@dps.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003

Measure:

Sport fishing violations.

Sec 117 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

First Quarter FY2002: 1,002 angler violations were acted upon.

First Quarter FY2001: 1,255 angler violations were acted upon. For the full Fiscal Year, 2,729 angler violations were acted upon.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no comparative data from other jurisdictions.

Background and Strategies:

The Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection protects Alaska's fish and wildlife resources by deterring violations or criminal activity through a combination of uniformed patrols, investigations and educational efforts. There are many difficulties associated with resource law enforcement and the Division routinely adjusts to address these challenges in the most productive manner.

Troopers devoted to fish and wildlife law enforcement cannot provide the level of visibility in all fisheries and hunting areas to assure that resource users comply with Fish and Game regulations. Resource user contact is one way to track basic deterrence which depends on a clear enforcement presence.

Carefully structured regional enforcement programs heighten presence of uniformed patrols in an area one season but target another area the next. Undercover operations might be selected as an enforcement strategy in one problem area, while education might be selected to focus on another area where particularly complex regulations have recently changed.

Measure:

Hunter contacts made by the division.

Sec 117 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

First Quarter FY2002: 7,562 hunter contacts were made by FWP.

First Quarter FY2001: 7,880 hunter contacts were made by FWP. For the full Fiscal Year, 16,772 hunter contacts were made.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no comparative data from other jurisdictions.

Background and Strategies:

The Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection protects Alaska's wildlife resources by deterring violations or criminal activity through a combination of uniformed patrols, investigations and educational efforts. There are many difficulties associated with resource law enforcement and the Division routinely adjusts to address these challenges in the most productive manner.

Troopers devoted to wildlife law enforcement cannot provide the level of visibility in all fisheries and hunting areas to assure that resource users comply with Fish and Game regulations. Resource user contacts is one way to track basic deterrence which depends on a clear enforcement presence.

Carefully structured regional enforcement programs heighten presence by uniformed patrols in an area one season but target another area the next. Undercover operations might be selected as an enforcement strategy in one problem area, while education might be selected to focus on another area where particularly complex regulations have recently changed.

Fire Prevention Budget Request Unit

Contact: Gary Powell, Director

Tel: (907) 269-5491 **Fax:** (907) 338-4375 **E-mail:** gary_powell@dps.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003

Measure:

The percentage of inspected buildings found in compliance with legal standards.
Sec 118 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

30% of all scheduled inspections to be found in compliance at the time of inspection.

First Quarter FY2002: Of 242 conducted inspections, 10.33% were found to be in compliance at the time of inspection.

First Quarter FY2001: Of 158 conducted inspections, 15% were found to be in compliance at the time of inspection.

Total FY 2001 Results: Of 1,144 inspections 4.54% were found to be compliant with legal standards.

Benchmark Comparisons:

No data available on state comparisons and the private sector does not participate in this service

Background and Strategies:

Not likely to achieve, but we expect to make significant progress. We estimate this to mean the percentage of the total number of scheduled inspections conducted that have been found to have no violations at the time of inspection. This is an educational process of the public related to regularly scheduled inspections. We anticipate that the percentage of buildings found in compliance will rise as we continue to inspect on an annual basis and provide for increased fire prevention education opportunities throughout the state. The target of 30% is an ambitious goal to work toward.

Measure:

The number of fire prevention educational contacts made by the division.
Sec 118 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Make 15,000 contacts for fire prevention education.

First Quarter FY2002: 21,337 contacts were made. 142% of goal achieved.

First Quarter FY2001: 5,418 contacts made.

Total FY2001 Results: There were 13,419 educational contacts. This was 89.46% of our goal.

Benchmark Comparisons:

Data from other states or departments are unavailable at this time.

Background and Strategies:

We have exceeded our goal because we were able to participate in a greater number of public forums to educate the public.

Measure:

The average time required to conduct initial building plan reviews.
Sec 118 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

80% of all initial comment letters or permits should be to the customer within 14 calendar days after receiving the fee.

First Quarter FY2002: Average time 4.7 days. Plan review on time rate is 75%.

First Quarter FY2001: Average time 10.9 days. Plan review on time rate was 78%.

Total FY 2001 Results: Average time to conduct plan reviews was 14.5 days based on 846 plan review submittals.
This was 95.6% of our goal.

Benchmark Comparisons:

Data from other states or departments is unavailable at this time.

Background and Strategies:

Building plan reviews are time critical to the overall construction process. Any unnecessary delays may result in construction project problems, so each plan review is conducted as expeditiously as possible. Hiring another Building Plan Reviewer dedicated to maintaining our target goal will assist in achieving a consistently responsive turnaround time.

Measure:

The number of priority occupancies inspected.
Sec 118 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

100 percent of 1,670 priority occupancy inspections.*

First Quarter FY2002: 242 inspections conducted for life safety compliance.

First Quarter FY2001: 158 inspections conducted for life safety compliance.

Total FY2001 Results: There were 1,144 inspections performed. This was 90% of our goal for that year.

Benchmark Comparisons:

Data from other states or departments is unavailable at this time.

Background and Strategies:

The Southcentral Region office, which conducts 2/3rds of the scheduled inspections, now has all positions filled that were earlier vacant due to promotions and resignations. We anticipate being at full staff, but not at full strength. Our newly hired deputy will be attending the Alaska Law Enforcement Academy this Spring, but training lead-time will not allow full use of this deputy until training is completed.

The term "priority occupancies" includes: assembly buildings; schools; headstart and daycare centers; TAPS facilities; jails; hospitals; respite/assisted living/residential care facilities; hotels and motels with more than 15 rooms.

*It should be noted that the number of "priority occupancies" can and does vary from year to year. This is driven by economic activity and code revisions. For example:

total for FY01 = 1,269

total for FY02 = 1,670

BRU/Component: Alaska State Trooper Detachments

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

Contact: Colonel Randy Crawford, Director

Tel: (907) 269-5641 **Fax:** (907) 337-2059 **E-mail:** randy_crawford@dps.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003**Measure:**

Homicides and the percent solved per year.
Sec 119 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:
CY2000 - 9 homicides; 100% solve rate
CY1999 - 25 homicides; 96% solve rate (or 24 cases)

The Division of Alaska State Troopers target for calendar year 2001 is to maintain the rate of homicides solved at 100%.

Benchmark Comparisons:

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of homicides and the percent solved per year. The national solve rate:

AST solve rate:

| | | |
|------|-----|------|
| 2000 | 63% | 100% |
| 1999 | 69% | 96% |

Background and Strategies:

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of homicides by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper homicide solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice.

Measure:

Rapes and the percent solved per year.
Sec 119 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:
CY2000 - 146 rapes occurred with a 53% solve rate (or 78 cases)
CY1999 - 156 rapes occurred with a 54% solve rate (or 85 cases)

Benchmark Comparisons:

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of rapes and the percent solved per year. The national solve rate:

AST solve rate:

| | | |
|------|-------|-----|
| 2000 | 46.9% | 53% |
| 1999 | 49% | 54% |

Background and Strategies:

Released December 15th
12/19/2001 3:10

FY2003 Governor
Department of Public Safety

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of rapes by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper rape solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice. **Rape** is defined as carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Attempts to commit rape by force or threat of force are also included.

Measure:

Burglaries and the percent solved per year.
Sec 119 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

In the Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction:

CY2000 - 1,415 burglaries occurred with a 20% solve rate (or 285 cases)

CY1999 - 1,175 burglaries occurred with a 23% solve rate (or 266 cases)

Benchmark Comparisons:

Calendar year 1999 is the benchmark year for the number of burglaries and the percent solved per year. The national solve rate:

AST solve rate:

| | | |
|------|-------|-----|
| 2000 | 13.4% | 20% |
| 1999 | 14.0% | 23% |

Background and Strategies:

As directed by the Finance subcommittee, the Division of Alaska State Troopers will be measuring the number of burglaries by calendar year within Alaska State Trooper primary jurisdiction and calculating the solve rate. Alaska State Trooper burglaries solve rate will be compared to the national average solve rate as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the Uniform Crime Report (U.C.R.) all States report their data to the Department of Justice. **Burglary** is defined as the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or theft. The use of force to gain entry is not required to classify an offense as burglary. Attempted burglaries are also reported.

Measure:

Response time to Division of Family & Youth Services (DFYS) "priority 1" reports of harm

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Respond to and initiate investigative efforts on all "Priority 1" Reports of Harm within 24 hours of AST receipt of the report.

This is a new measure. AST has established a case tracking system. Response statistics will be available next year for comparison purposes and monitoring program performance.

Background and Strategies:

Quick response time to a DFYS "Priority 1" Reports of Harm case is critical to the well being of a child. Though AST case data is currently incomplete, it is known that a number of cases receive less than adequate attention. While efforts are made to respond to those cases that pose an immediate and ongoing risk of harm, other priority 1 cases are sometimes delayed due to the unavailability of an investigator. This occurs particularly in the Fairbanks and Mat-Su areas, and on the Kenai Peninsula.

Reports of Harm are prioritized by DFYS case intake staff according to the immediate or potential risk of harm to the child. A priority 1 rating is the most serious and should ideally require a coordinated and immediate response to both protect the child and to initiate an effective investigation.

"Priority 1" represents those cases presenting the greatest degree of risk to a child and requiring an emergency response, including: immediate danger; has suffered serious physical injury due to abuse or neglect; in immediate need of medical attention; cause of death suspicious and has siblings who remain in home; disclosed sexual abuse and there is current risk/accessibility.

BRU/Component: Alaska Police Standards Council

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

Contact: Irl T. Stambaugh, Executive Director

Tel: (907) 465-4378 Fax: (907) 465-3263 E-mail: irl_stambaugh@dps.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003

Measure:

Recruit training funded.

Sec 120 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

APSC Target

Fund basic recruit training for 40 officers (25,760 hours)

Fund 10 officers (800 hours) in a re-certification academy.

FY2001: 49 officers (31,556 hours); 12 officers in re-certification (960 hours)

FY2000: 38 officers (24,472 hours); 11 officers in re-certification (880 hours)

Target has been met.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no comparative data from other jurisdictions.

Background and Strategies:

In 1994 the legislature established the Alaska Police Training Fund, which benefits from surcharges assessed for violations of certain traffic offenses. In 1998 the legislature expanded the list of criminal offenses and violations on which a surcharge can be levied. These legislative measures have been successful in providing additional funding needed to support statewide police and corrections basic and in-service training.

Note: In prior years comparisons were based upon six months of data (July - December). Going forward, starting with this budget submission, comparisons will be based upon full fiscal year data (July - June).

Measure:

Advanced training funded.

Sec 120 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

APSC Target

Fund 25,000 hours of in-service training

FY2001: 27,392 hours (876 officers)

FY2000: 25,126 hours (1,158 officers)

Target has been met.

Benchmark Comparisons:

There is no comparative data from other jurisdictions.

Background and Strategies:

In 1994 the legislature established the Alaska Police Training Fund, which benefits from surcharges assessed for violations of certain traffic offenses. In 1998 the legislature expanded the list of criminal offenses and violations on which a surcharge can be levied. These legislative measures have provided additional funding needed to support statewide police and corrections basic and in-service training.

Note: In prior years comparisons were based upon six months of data (July - December). Going forward, starting with this budget submission, comparisons will be based upon full fiscal year data (July - June).

BRU/Component: Violent Crimes Compensation Board

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

Contact: Susan Browne, Administrator

Tel: (907) 465-3040 **Fax:** (907) 465-2379 **E-mail:** susan_browne@dps.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003**Measure:**

Average time from receipt of a claim to the board's final determination.

Sec 121 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

The measure was new in FY01.

| | | Target | Actual |
|------|------|---------------|---------|
| FY01 | Goal | 90 - 150 days | 70 days |
| FY02 | Goal | 90 - 150 days | |

Benchmark Comparisons:

The Board will strive to process claims within 90 to 150 calendar days in accordance with the nationally recognized benchmark of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime recommendations for the 21st Century.

Background and Strategies:

The basic strategy is to decrease the amount of time it takes to process a claim through the various statutory and regulatory requirements connected with Board determination. The Board has delegated authority to close certain claims to the Board's Administrator and has implemented a claim review with recommendation process to expedite claim determinations.

BRU/Component: Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

Contact: Juanita Hensley, Interim Executive Director

Tel: (907) 465-4356 **Fax:** (907) 465-3627 **E-mail:** juanita_hensley@dps.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003

Measure:

The percentage of continuing clients.
Sec 122 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

FY01 case numbers

Total number of victims of domestic violence: 7,271
Total number of repeat victims of domestic violence: 3,563
Percentage: 49%

Total number of victims of sexual assault: 2,146
Total number of repeat victims of sexual assault: 500
Percentage: 23.3%

These numbers represent one full fiscal year of data. These numbers are gathered by the Council's database that was implemented on July 1, 2000. When we report to the legislature for FY03 we will be able to report two full years of data. The data represents clients served by Council funded programs.

Background and Strategies:

The national average number of times a victim of domestic violence needs to be in a shelter prior to having enough resources, safety and confidence to permanently remove the victim from the violence is 12 visits.

It is the hope of the Council that victims of domestic violence and sexual assault return to programs for continuing services as long as they are in need of help. In these case, of course, we will see repeat percentages increase.

Measure:

The percentage of the council's budget spent on prevention.
Sec 122 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Council's budget, by fiscal year, allocated specifically for prevention efforts:

FY2002 - 38%*
FY2001 - 45%
FY2000 - 42%

Background and Strategies:

The budget amount represented here is calculated by the specific projects identified each year for system change and improvement, media outreach, prevention campaigns, outreach to rural areas, and specific one-time projects that have been identified and funded by federal grants. This amount does fluctuate based on the special project funds available on a federal level each year.

*The Council applied for an additional \$1.6 million in grants for prevention this year. However it did not receive approval for the additional money. If it had been awarded, 44% of total program funding would have been directed towards prevention efforts.

Measure:

The cost of shelter per night.
Sec 122 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

In FY01, the estimated cost of a shelter night was \$69.83 per night.

In FY00, the estimated cost of a shelter night was \$68.00 per night.
The difference between the cost of FY00 and FY01 was adjusted by using the increase in the CPI of 2.7%.

Background and Strategies:

This estimate is determined by taking the costs of all direct services staff, rent, insurance, utilities and food costs and dividing this amount by the number of clients served. This is a simplistic and less than accurate method of determining costs as each shelter utilizes state funds in a different way. Based on the resources available on a local level, each program uses the state funds to balance the full costs each year. In most areas, the communities donate the shelters.

Measure:

The amount spent for and the percentage reduction in domestic violence and sexual assault compared to the amount spent for that purpose last year.
Sec 122 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Estimated prevention funds in:

| | |
|------|-----------|
| FY00 | \$3,919.0 |
| FY01 | \$4,411.0 |

Estimated prevention funds scheduled to be spent in:

| | |
|------|-----------|
| FY02 | \$3,769.0 |
|------|-----------|

Percentage reduction in domestic violence and sexual assault cases from FY99-00 and from FY00-01.

DPS Sexual Assault cases:

| | | | |
|------|--------|------|-------|
| FY00 | +12.8% | FY01 | - 27% |
|------|--------|------|-------|

DPS Domestic Violence cases:

| | | | |
|------|--------|------|------|
| FY00 | +39.9% | FY01 | +10% |
|------|--------|------|------|

Combined DPS domestic violence and sexual assault cases:

| | | | |
|------|--------|------|-----|
| FY00 | +30.8% | FY01 | +5% |
|------|--------|------|-----|

Background and Strategies:

The amount of prevention funds include all federal funds that are provided to law enforcement, prosecution, courts, corrections and victims service programs to work towards ending domestic violence and sexual assault. These numbers reflect only the known reported cases to APSIN. These numbers do not include all police departments and do not reflect consistent definitions. There is currently no statewide collection of data for these crimes. The closest statewide crime data is the Uniform Crime Reporting System, however only 30 of Alaska's police agencies consistently contribute crime data to this system. There are two key factors in considering this measure. Historically, only 10-16% of all domestic violence and sexual assault cases are ever reported to law enforcement. Secondly, when prevention efforts are increased, there are more victims reached leading to an increase in the number of police reports made and services requested. To see an actual decrease in domestic violence and sexual assault cases, based on prevention efforts, is a long-term goal.

Measure:

The incidence of reported domestic violence and sexual assault cases.
 Sec 122 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

The closest statewide crime data is the Uniform Crime Reporting System, however only 30 of Alaska's police agencies consistently contribute crime data to this system.

| | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|--------|
| DPS reports domestic violence cases for: | FY00 2904 | FY01 3208 | +10% |
| DPS reports sexual assault cases for: | FY00 387 | FY01 284 | -27% . |
| DPS reports sexual abuse of a minor for: | FY00 611 | FY01 543 | -11% . |

Background and Strategies:

For this measure, the data can only be drawn from cases addressed by the Alaska State Troopers. No statewide database for crime reporting exists. The closest statewide crime data is the Uniform Crime Reporting System, however only 30 of Alaska's police agencies consistently contribute crime data to this system.

Measure:

The number of homicides from domestic violence and sexual assault.
 Sec 122 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

These numbers are based on calendar year not fiscal year.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|
| CY1998 DV Related Homicides 14 | | |
| CY1999 DV Related Homicides 22; | Percent change from previous year | + 6.6% |
| CY2000 DV Related Homicides 5; | Percent change from previous year | - 23.5% |

Background and Strategies:

The number of homicides resulting from these crimes is not consistently identified as such. Identifying homicides as being related to sexual assault is not consistently reported within the state's law enforcement agencies. The same can be true for domestic violence as there may have been domestic violence identified in the investigation but the crime is classified as a homicide with no reference to the domestic violence.

An accurate number for homicides related to sexual assault or domestic violence cannot be established.

Statewide Support Budget Request Unit

Contact: Kenneth E. Bischoff, Administrative Services Director

Tel: (907) 465-4336 **Fax:** (907) 586-2762 **E-mail:** kenneth_bischoff@dpst.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003

Measure:

The percentage of divisions that meet assigned performance measures.
Sec 123 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

For FY02, the department was assigned 27 measures in Sections 117-126 of Chapter 90, SLA 2001. The department has added a new measure for FY03 within the AST Detachment BRU: Response Time to DFYS "priority 1" reports of harm.

The Department of Public Safety's target is to meet 100% of assigned performance measures.

Of the 28 measures, Public Safety met or exceeded the target for 21 (75 percent), and including this measure was short of the target for seven (25 percent).

Benchmark Comparisons:

For Benchmarks see BRU Narrative.

Some Measures have Benchmark comparatives with other jurisdictions, some do not.

Background and Strategies:

Each division director or program manager is responsible for taking appropriate management strategies to work toward achieving his or her performance measure(s). Periodic teleconferences are held by the Commissioner's Office to discuss performance measures.

Measure:

The average time taken to respond to complaints and questions that have been elevated to the commissioner's office.
Sec 123 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Goal is to respond to all written inquiries within a reasonable timeframe; not to exceed 15 calendar days.

Averaged response time for period January 2001 - September 2001: 15.5 calendar days

Response time was calculated by dividing the sum of days lapsed (680) by number of inquiries (44).

Background and Strategies:

This is a new measure. The department has instituted an electronic-based correspondence tracking system. In future years, this system will allow for historical comparisons and complete compliance with measure.

In developing this year's analysis ("number of inquiries") the department employed the following guidelines:

1. "Complaints and questions" must have been in writing;
2. only "public" inquiries were considered; and
3. "average time taken" was based upon calendar days.

Measure:

The cost per officer trained.
Sec 124 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

Released December 15th
12/19/2001 3:10

FY2003 Governor
Department of Public Safety

The Academy's goal is to avoid increasing costs of attending an Alaska Law Enforcement Training (ALET) class. The cost of ALET training from 1999 through 2001 has remained constant at \$6,041 per officer.

Benchmark Comparisons:

No benchmarks available.

Background and Strategies:

Tuition is an approximation of the direct costs related to room, board and training for an ALET student. The tuition includes most direct operating costs like linen cleaning, ammunition, vehicle maintenance expenses, guest instructor travel, and off site facility rentals.

Measure:

The graduation rate.

Sec 124 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

The Academy's target is to maintain a 90% or higher graduation rate.

Actual graduation rates:

FY2001 95.7% (67 of 70 recruits: Fall 2000 & Spring 2001 classes)

FY2000 98.5% (66 of 68 recruits: Fall 1999 & Spring 2000 classes)

Benchmark Comparisons:

There are no national standards for Academy graduation rates. The Anchorage Police Department Academy had an 87% graduation rate averaged over their last three basic officer classes.

Background and Strategies:

According to University of Alaska Southeast requirements, the Academy counts enrollment at the end of the second week of the 14-week basis ALET course. Students arrive at the Academy from three main sources: Department of Public Safety (AST and FWP), municipal police departments, and the University of Alaska Southeast. Due to different recruitment and hiring processes, not all students are equally suited to the physical and mental stresses of Academy life. Furthermore, some students arrive with pre-existing injuries that become aggravated by physical conditioning training. Consequently, graduation figures are based on the numbers of students who graduate and were enrolled after the first two weeks.

Measure:

The percentage of officers who remain employed as law enforcement officers one year after graduating.

Sec 124 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

The Academy's goal is to train officers so well that they all successfully complete field training and remain employed after one year. The department began tracking this measure with the FY2000 (Fall/Spring 2000 ALET) graduates. As of September 2001, 86.4% (57 of 66 graduates) of the FY2000 ALET graduates remain employed in the field of law enforcement.

Benchmark Comparisons:

National benchmark standards are not available for this measure. The Anchorage Police Department Academy reports that 66% of the graduates of its March 2000 basic officer course are still employed with APD 16 months later.

Background and Strategies:

The Department of Public Safety began tracking this measure with the Spring 2000 ALET graduates.

The Academy attempted to contact all officers who graduated from the Spring 2000 ALET class. In some cases, they had left the state, but verification of their employment status was accomplished. The figures do not reflect college students who began the class unemployed or United States Coast Guard students who attend as basic students but who are in fact seasoned military law enforcement veterans.

There are many reasons that officers do not remain employed after a year. In some cases they decide law enforcement is not the career for them. In other cases, they are unable to engage with the public and properly do police work. Sometimes personal reasons require them to relocate to other states.

Measure:

The cost of administrative services as compared to the total personnel costs for the department.
Sec 125 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

This measure is calculated by dividing the personal services costs for the Administrative Services component by the department's total personal services costs.

FY02: $\$56,408.4 / \$1,588.6 = 2.8\%$

FY01: $\$53,694.7 / \$1,551.8 = 2.9\%$

Since this measure was first included for FY01, that year's percentage ratio is being treated as a baseline target to maintain or improve (by reducing the percentage ratio).

Benchmark Comparisons:

None. There is no comparative data from other jurisdictions.

Background and Strategies:

This is an arithmetic calculation based upon "Enacted" personal services figures from all funding sources, per each year's "short form" published by the Legislative Finance Division.

Measure:

The number of department employee grievances as compared to the total number of grievances for all state departments.
Sec 125 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

According to the Department of Administration, the Department of Public Safety received 8 grievances or 4.08% of the 196 received by all departments during the **first quarter of FY02**.

In the FY02 budget it was reported that the Department of Public Safety received 3 grievances or 2.75% of the 109 received by all departments during the **first quarter of FY01**.

Benchmark Comparisons:

None. There is no comparative data from other jurisdictions.

Background and Strategies:

While the measure states "grievances," our statewide data, as currently compiled by the Department of Administration, is based upon blended statistics which combine grievances and complaints. Both are disputes between labor union(s) and department management that have been submitted in writing on forms accepted by the State, but there are differences. Complaints do not involve contract application or interpretation; grievances can proceed to binding arbitration.

BRU/Component: Laboratory Services

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

Contact: George Taft, Director

Tel: (907) 269-5687 **Fax:** (907) 338-6614 **E-mail:** george_taft@dps.state.ak.us

Key Performance Measures for FY2003**Measure:**

Average time from receipt of a case to issuance of a report.

Sec 126 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

FY01 average time is 99 days

FY00 average time is 57 days.

A number of factors (see Background and Strategies) in FY01 made it impossible for the Lab to meet the FY00 57 day average turnaround time from receipt of a request to issuance of a laboratory report to law enforcement.

Calculation of the average response time:

| TYPE OF ANALYSIS | NUMBER OF DAYS TO ISSUE A REPORT | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| | <u>FY00</u> | <u>FY01</u> |
| Controlled Substances | 22 | 15 |
| Latent Fingerprints | 59 | 137 |
| Toxicology | 11 | 17 |
| Criminalistics | 99 | 126 |
| Firearms/Toolmarks | 61 | 93 |
| Trace Evidence | 37 | 68 |
| Serology | 49 | 70 |
| DNA | 153 | 292 |
| Crime Scene | <u>21</u> | <u>72</u> |
| Average Days | 57 | 99 |

Background and Strategies:

The average time from receipt of a case to issuance of a report is determined by utilizing a case access program to calculate the number of days between the date a case is received at the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory and the date a report is written by an analyst. This task is complicated by the fact that many different types of analyses are performed at the Crime Lab, including: Controlled Substances, Fingerprints, Toxicology (blood alcohol only), Criminalistics (arson, footwear and tire track impressions, physical matching), Trace Evidence (hairs and fibers), Firearms/Toolmarks, Serology, DNA, and Crime Scenes. Once the average reporting time is calculated for each exam type, the overall average time from receipt of a case to issuance of a report can be determined.

The increased "average time," experienced in FY01, is due to the following:

- a. many old DNA cases, with no known suspect, were pulled and analyzed with the hope of finding a CODIS match;
- b. new DNA personnel spent most of the year in forensic analysis training necessary to meet required new DNA Quality Assurance Standards;
- c. the same new DNA Quality Assurance Standards required all critical "reagents" (chemicals) used in DNA testing to be verified prior to use (contamination prevention) with the forensic evidence;
- d. all sections spent some time preparing for Lab accreditation (July 2001);
- e. two criminalist positions were vacant in FY01;

- f. two latent examiners resigned during the year;
- g. accomodating DA requests to hold evidence, longer than normal, until decision is made whether to prosecute or not.

Additional resources provided to the Crime Lab in the FY02 budget should reverse the trend that was witnessed between FY00 and FY01.

Measure:

Average cost per case.

Sec 126 Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

Alaska's Target & Progress:

| | |
|------|------------|
| FY01 | \$ 1,420.0 |
| FY00 | \$ 1,249.0 |

Average cost is calculated by dividing the program's authorized budget by the number of cases analyzed in that particular year (FY01 1,700 cases / FY00 1,684 cases)

Background and Strategies:

At the end of the fiscal year, the final authorized level of funding is known and the total number of cases that have been analyzed by the Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory is compiled. By dividing the Lab's fiscal year budget by the number of cases analyzed in that same fiscal year, the amount derived is the average cost per case. The average cost per case can vary greatly depending on the type of case, such as DNA compared to a latent fingerprint; the nature of the case, such as homicide compared to burglary; and the number of items to be analyzed per case.